



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,513	10/25/2002	Zewei Chen	2000-0009	2134

26652 7590 09/28/2004

AT&T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

COBY, FRANTZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,513

Applicant(s)

CHEN, ZEWEI

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 January 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to application filed on October 25, 2002 in which claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings filed on January 13, 2003 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 7, 8-9, 14-17, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the data dictionary" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitations "the data dictionary" in lines 3 and 5; "the field offset" in lines 4-5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Art Unit: 2171

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the field offset" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitations "the data dictionary" in line 4; "the field offset" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the data dictionary" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitations "the data dictionary" in lines 3-4; "the field offset" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the field offset" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the method for retrieving" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the data dictionary" in lines 3 and 5; "the field offset" in lines 4 and 4-5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitations "the field offset" in lines 3 and 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitations "the data dictionary" in line 4; "the field offset" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Madany et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,774,715.

As per claim 1, Madany et al. disclose "a method for improving compression of data" by providing a file system level compression using holes (See Madany et al. Title). In particular, Madany et al. discloses the claimed limitations "arranging the data on a mixed format physical layout; dividing the data on a mixed format physical layout into fixed-sized fields and variable sized fields" (See Madany et al. col. 8, lines 1-61). Also, Madany et al. disclose the claimed feature of

Art Unit: 2171

“compressing the data of the variable sized fields and the fixed-sized fields” by providing a mechanism for compressing data at a fixed-sized fields level (Figure 5e and corresponding text).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “storing sizes of the fixed-sized fields in a data dictionary; storing frequency of the data in the fixed-sized fields and the variable-sized fields in the data dictionary; and storing information common to all records in the fixed-sized fields and variable sized fields in the data dictionary” as a mapping table where the data is stored (See Madany et al. Abstract; Col. 3, lines 45-61).

As per claims 3-4, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed feature of “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise field values” and “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise field offsets” (See Madany et al. Figure 4a and corresponding text; Col. 8, lines 1-61)

As per claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise pointers into the

Art Unit: 2171

data dictionary" (See Madany et al. Col 5, lines 38-40; Col. 14, lines 31-47; Col 15, lines 25-28).

As per claims 6-9, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-5. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 10, Madany et al. disclose "method for improving compression of data" by providing a file system level compression using holes (See Madany et al. Title). In particular, Madany et al. disclose the claimed feature of "arranging the data on a mixed format layout, wherein the data comprises of a group of correlated fields; dividing the data on a mixed format physical layout into fixed-sized fields and variable-sized fields" (See Madany et al. col. 8, lines 1-61). Also, Madany et al. disclose the claimed features of "compressing the data of the variable-sized fields and the fixed-sized fields" (Figure 5e and corresponding text).

As per claim 11, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "storing sizes of the fixed-sized fields in a data dictionary; storing frequency of the data in the fixed-sized fields and the variable-sized fields in the data dictionary; storing information common to all records in the fixed-sized fields

Art Unit: 2171

and variable sized fields in the data dictionary” as a mapping table where the data is stored (See Madany et al. Abstract; Col. 3, lines 45-61).

As per claims 12-13 most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed feature of “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise field values” and “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise field offsets” (See Madany et al. Figure 4a and corresponding text; Col. 8, lines 1-61)

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the fixed-sized fields further comprise pointers into the data dictionary” (See Madany et al. Col 5, lines 38-40; Col. 14, lines 31-47; Col 15, lines 25-28).

As per claims 15-16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 10-14. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claims 17-18, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-5 above. In addition, Madany et al. disclose the claimed feature of “retrieving compressed data” by providing mechanisms that permits When a user reads a compressed file at a file offset the file system will

Art Unit: 2171

retrieve the stored compression unit that contains the bytes at the offset, expand the data and return it to the user (See Madany et al. Col. 11, lines 53-65).

As per claim 19, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 20, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 17-18. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claims 21-29, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-10. There are therefore rejected as set forth above.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 703 305-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex (Monday-Saturday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2171

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2171

September 17, 2004